

Remarks

1. Applicants acknowledge that the corrected drawings are approved by the Examiner.
2. The disclosure was objected to because of the reference on pages 8 and 15 to "FIG. 1" since the drawing no longer is so labeled. Applicants have addressed the referencing with respect to the figure by deleting all references to "FIG. 1", simply referring to the FIGURE in the specification. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.
3. Claim 24 was rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly the subject matter regarded as the invention. Specifically, the Markush grouping language was stated as being improperly presented because of the use of the word "or". The Action indicated that claim 24 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome this basis for rejection. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 24 is presented for entry with amended Markush language that employs the word "and" and not the disjunctive wording. Accordingly, entry of this amendatory language is requested since it is submitted that it places the claim in condition for allowance and requires no additional searching. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, therefore, are respectfully requested.
4. Claims 1-7 and 10-12 were rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over Fukui in view of Menhennett et al. Claim 13 was rejected under the same provisions over the same references and further in view of Oka et al. Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under the same provisions as being obvious over Fukui and Menhennett et al. as applied to claim 1 and further in view of publication KR2002-12819 by Jang et al. These three rejections

were the same as given in their respective paragraphs 5, 6, and 7 of the previous Office Action. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Final Rejection stated that the lack of a definition or requirement of "permeate" in the claims or the specification required that the word permeate be given the broadest definition. This was interpreted to mean to penetrate or diffuse into an article. The Office Action stated further that there was no depth penetration requirement in the term "permeate". The Final Rejection, therefore, concluded that the teaching of Fukui that the dye penetrates into the object surface reads on the claim limitation of "permeate". In this response Applicants propose amendment to claim 1 for entry to specifically recite that the infiltration agent is allowed to penetrate the three-dimensional object and "colorize the entire internal volume of the object to thereby establish a desired appearance of the three-dimensional object." Support for this language is found on page 22, at lines 16-18. It is submitted that the addition of this specific limitation patentably distinguishes over Fukui and all other cited references in view of the arguments presented previously that sublimation dye coloration does not penetrate to the internal volume of the three-dimensional object. The references only teach penetration of the surface to an extremely small depth and teach away from penetration into the entire internal volume of a three-dimensional object. Applicants therefore submit that independent claim 1 as now presented and its dependent claims 2-15 are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested. In the alternative, should this proposed amendment still not be deemed to place the claims in condition for allowance, Applicants request entry of the amendments presented herein to narrow and more precisely focus the issues for appeal. It is submitted that the proposed claim amendment requires no new searching and introduces no new matter.

5. In summary, claims 1-15 and 24 remain in the application. Presented for entry are amendments to claims 1 and 24. A minor change has been made to the specification on pages 8 and 15. None of the proposed amendatory changes introduce new matter. Accordingly, their entry is respectfully requested.

PATENT
USA.302

Pursuant to currently recommended Patent Office practice, the Examiner is expressly authorized to call the Applicant's attorney collect at Valencia, California, if in his judgment disposition of this application could be expedited or if he considers the application not ready for examination or final disposition by other than allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

July 23, 2003

Ralph D'Alessandro
Reg. No. 28,838
Attorney for Applicants

3D Systems, Inc.
26081 Avenue Hall
Valencia, CA 91355
(661) 295-5600, ext. 2404

FAX RECEIVED
JUL 24 2003
GROUP 1700